

The question arises on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair. Delegate Sickles.

DELEGATE SICKLES: I just want to announce in advance I will not erode the authority of the Chair in this decision.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Bothe.

DELEGATE BOTHE: Mr. President, I will withdraw the motion. It is obvious that it is bound to be defeated.

THE PRESIDENT: The motion is withdrawn.

Delegate Bothe.

DELEGATE BOTHE: I will, however, move for reconsideration of the vote by which Amendment No. 5 has been accepted.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Bothe, the Chair calls your attention to the fact that if you desire to do so, without the formality of the two-day layover rule, and the 15 signatures you should do so before there is final action with respect to 1.17.

You do not have to at this moment, but you should do it before that time.

For what purpose does Delegate White rise?

DELEGATE WHITE: Mr. President, I was going to offer—

THE PRESIDENT: I am sorry, I cannot understand you.

DELEGATE WHITE: I intended to offer a motion to reconsider, but I am not intending to engineer this operation. In the absence of objection, I would move that we would reconsider now.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there a second to Delegate White's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 5. Just a moment, before we move that. I think the Chair has to announce the results on the statement of Delegate Pascal; the record of the vote on Amendment No. 5 will be corrected to show Delegate Pascal voted Aye in which event the vote on the Amendment becomes 68 in the affirmative, and 66 in the negative, and the motion passes.

Amendment No. 5 is adopted.

Delegate White has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 5 was adopted.

Is there a second to that motion?

*(The motion was duly seconded.)*

The motion is seconded.

For what purpose does Delegate James rise?

DELEGATE JAMES: I would like a clarification of the parliamentary procedure, and the point that I am interested in is whether or not this is a substantive vote.

My inquiry is that section 1.17 has now been stricken from the proposed constitution. Now, the motion to reconsider legislative procedures stands by itself, and it is not a substantive vote. My understanding of the rules being followed here is that if the motion to reconsider is adopted, this reinstates section 1.17 in the proposed constitution, so that it is a substantive and not merely a procedural vote. Am I correct?

THE PRESIDENT: I am not sure that I would characterize it as such, but the end result is as you have indicated.

Very well, Delegate White, do you desire to speak to the motion to reconsider?

DELEGATE WHITE: Mr. President, I do not wish to make a speech, but I do hope that everyone will carefully vote green or red, and look so that we will not be forced in a position of having a certain cloud which exists now.

I believe there is one about the whole operation, and there are a lot of strange and mysterious things happening over this issue and if we are going to be men and women, let us stand up and vote so that we can be counted.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Bamberger.

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak first in favor of reconsideration, and secondly to state my own need for information.

No issue has so divided this Convention. No issue of substance has failed or passed by such a close vote within this Convention. Last week we heard arguments as to why this should not be in the constitution. I thought all of those arguments were cured by the amendment which was sponsored by delegates who had voted on both sides of this provision.

If there is some other important reason why this provision of section 1.17, which is obviously very important to almost an even minority, or half of the delegates in this Convention, and which I think we would also recognize is very important, if not as a matter of substance, then certainly as a symbol to hundreds of thousands of people in this State, then I should like to hear those arguments which support the propo-